

former cadets who attended the A&M College of Texas, thus promoting and maintaining fellowship. The Ex-Cadets Association was reorganized to form the Alumni Association in 1888.

Developing throughout the years in tandem with the Alpha Phi Fraternity, which was founded in the 1890s and included former students who had not graduated, a coalition was formed in 1919 to formally reorganize and adopt the name The Association of Former Students.

This name was written into the charter granted by the State of Texas in 1925. In this charter, the association committed to “support of benevolent, charitable, and educational undertakings by extending financial and other aid to students at Texas A&M; by promoting social, literary, and scientific pursuits; by perpetuating and strengthening the ties of affection and esteem formed in university or college days; by promoting the interests and welfare of Texas A&M University and education generally in the State of Texas.”

Since its first day of class over 143 years ago, with six professors and 40 students, the university has grown to become one of the largest Tier 1 research and education institutions in the United States, with almost 70,000 students, thousands of faculty and staff, and close to a billion dollars of annual research activity.

□ 1245

Through its existence, the Association of Former Students has continued to grow rapidly. Today it serves more than 508,000 former students of Texas A&M University and generates an impact of almost \$14 million annually for university support through scholarships, student activities, and long-revered traditions, such as the Aggie Ring Program.

As the university has grown and developed, the Aggie Network—as the organization is commonly referred to today—has evolved but has always maintained its core values and commitments to the university, its current students and its former students. Together, the association and the university collaborate to maintain six core values of: loyalty, integrity, excellence, leadership, selfless service, and respect. These are the core values that unite all Texas A&M students and by which all Aggies strive to live.

As former chairman of the board of the Association of Former Students during 2007, I am honored and humbled to be able to recognize the accomplishments of the organization over the past 140 years. The Aggie Network is truly the glue that unites our current students, former students, and our responsibilities to live our core values every day.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the recent 140th anniversary of the Association of Former Students of Texas A&M University, I applaud the organization's ongoing commitment to all

Texas Aggies and to the core values of our beloved institution.

I have requested that the United States flag be flown over our Nation's Capitol to honor the 140 years of legacy and the impact of the worldwide Aggie Network.

As I close today, I urge all Americans to continue to pray for our country, for our military men and women who keep us safe, and for our first responders who protect us at home.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REFLECTIONS ON THE WAR POWERS DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, throughout the debate yesterday on the so-called War Powers Resolution, fundamental misunderstandings surfaced that I think need to be addressed.

The first misunderstanding is that the justification for the attack that killed Soleimani was that he was an evil terrorist responsible for the deaths of hundreds of Americans. Well, there are a lot of evil terrorists out there, and that does not give the President authority to launch attacks on foreign countries to kill them.

But what did give the President authority in this case, was the fact that Soleimani was acting as an armed combatant against U.S. forces in a war zone in which the Congress had authorized the President to take military action through the Authorization for the Use of Military Force in Iraq in 2002.

Now, I hate to shock my woke colleagues, but killing active enemy combatants is what war is all about, and it is a war that Congress started with that act.

That act of Congress provides: “The President is authorized to use the Armed Forces of the United States as he determines to be necessary and appropriate in order to defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq.”

The very nature of this authority includes combating hostile militia and armed proxies acting within Iraq against American forces. That is exactly what the President did.

The authorization to use military force did not end with the defeat of Saddam Hussein any more than the President's military authority in Japan and Germany ended with the defeat of Hirohito and Hitler.

In those cases, the President's authority didn't terminate until 1952 and 1955, respectively, and the President's military authority in Iraq remains in effect until the President and Congress terminate it.

Now, the second misunderstanding is that the President's action was an at-

tack on Iran. It most certainly was not. It was carried out in the theater of war defined by Congress against a combatant who was commanding hostile forces against American troops.

Not only did the President act entirely within his legal authority as Commander in Chief, but within his moral responsibility to protect American military and diplomatic personnel and American citizens in Iraq.

The third misunderstanding is that the War Powers Act is applicable in this circumstance. The War Powers Act governs only those circumstances when the President responds without congressional authority to an attack upon the United States, its territory or possessions, or its Armed Forces. In this case, the President already had congressional authority.

The fourth misunderstanding is that the attack on Soleimani was equivalent to President Obama's attack on Libya. The two are entirely different matters. The attack on Libya had no congressional authorization and the War Powers Act did not apply because Mr. Obama's military attack was not in response to an attack on the United States, its territory or possessions, or its Armed Forces.

It was an entirely unprovoked attack, entirely unauthorized and, accordingly, it was entirely illegal.

I think as we go forward, we need to get back to some basic, fundamental understandings about the constitutional parameters of war powers.

The American Founders made a sharp distinction between starting a war and waging a war for some very good reasons. They understood that this most solemn and lethal decision should not be entrusted to one individual whose authority would be greatly augmented by it.

The decision to start a war was given exclusively to Congress to assure that every voice in the country was heard, and that Congress, once having taken that stand, would be obligated to put the resources of the country behind that war and those fighting it.

But once the war has begun, the Founders wanted a single Commander in Chief directing it with clear and unambiguous authority. There is no surer path to military disaster than having 535 squabbling *prima donnas* second-guessing every decision being made.

Thus, the President can wage war but cannot declare it, and the Congress can declare war but cannot wage it.

The Founders debated these principles thoroughly during the Constitutional Convention. They recognized that the President did need certain residual military power to repel an attack when Congress couldn't act. And I believe the War Powers Act faithfully defines these circumstances and establishes a framework to contain them.

But the War Powers Act does not give the President the authority to

launch military attacks except in response to a direct attack on our country, nor can it limit the President's authority as Commander in Chief once Congress does authorize war.

I believe the 2002 Authorization for the Use of Military Force in Iraq was a colossal mistake. It created a dangerous power vacuum. It was never supported with the full resources of the United States, and it was without provocation.

But there should be no rewriting of history here. It might have been George W. Bush who advocated for the war and Bush, Obama, and now President Trump who have waged it, but it was Congress' adoption of the AUMF that formally started it.

And once started, only the President can wage it. President Trump inherited this mess and history will judge how well he handles it. Certainly, in this instance, the President not only had clear and unambiguous authority to order the attack, he had a moral imperative to do so.

What is crystal clear from the debate yesterday is that if the Democrats had had their way, Soleimani would be alive today, and the attack on American troops that he was in the final stages of planning would have unfolded. We would likely, today, be mourning very many American casualties.

If the President, knowing that this attack was coming and in full possession of the opportunity and the authority to stop it, had taken the Democrats' advice and done nothing, he would have been deeply culpable for the loss of these Americans. It is shocking to me, and perhaps to the country as well, that even in hindsight this is the course the Democrats have made clear that they prefer.

That brings me to the nature of the resolution that the House passed yesterday. The separation of war powers between the legislative and executive branches has been badly blurred in recent decades, and I do believe that we need to reestablish not only the constitutional principles that separate the declaring of war from the waging of war, but also the American tradition that we only go to war when we have been attacked.

When we must go to war, we have the utmost obligation to put the entire might and resources and attention of the Nation behind it, and to get it over with just as quickly as possible.

Now, that is a legitimate debate to have, but that is not what the House did yesterday. Yesterday, it deliberately and recklessly undermined the position of the United States Government and the United States Armed Forces that we sent to Iraq, shredding the tradition that politics stop at the water's edge.

In a perilous moment, the House refused to stand behind the war that it had authorized in 2002, refused to protect the men and women that it placed in harm's way, and it gave a hostile

foreign power a major propaganda victory.

That is yet another stain upon the honor of this House, and one which should be deplored and condemned through the ages to come.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

IMPOSING SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO ADDITIONAL SECTORS OF IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-94)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) (IEEPA), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order (the "order") with respect to Iran that takes additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995.

The order takes steps to deny Iran revenue, including revenue derived from the export of products from key sectors of Iran's economy, that may be used to fund and support its nuclear program, missile development, terrorism and terrorist proxy networks, and malign regional influence.

The order blocks the property and interests in property of persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State:

to operate in the construction, mining, manufacturing, or textiles sectors of the Iranian economy, or any other sector of the Iranian economy as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State;

to have knowingly engaged, on or after the date of the order, in a significant transaction for the sale, supply, or transfer to or from Iran of significant goods or services used in connection with a sector of the Iranian economy specified in, or determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, pursuant to, section 1(a)(i) of the order;

to have materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order; or

to be owned or controlled by, or to have acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order.

The order also authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation

with the Secretary of State, to impose correspondent account and payable-through account-related sanctions on a foreign financial institution upon determining the foreign financial institution has, on or after the date of the order, knowingly conducted or facilitated a significant financial transaction:

for the sale, supply, or transfer to or from Iran of significant goods or services used in connection with a sector of the Iranian economy specified in, or determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, pursuant to, section 1(a)(i) of the order; or

for or on behalf of any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to section 1 of the order.

I have delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the authority to take such actions, including adopting rules and regulations, to employ all powers granted to the President by IEEPA as may be necessary to implement the order.

I am enclosing a copy of the order I have issued.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, January 10, 2020.

WEAPONIZATION OF LANGUAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

I come to the floor today, Mr. Speaker, because this is the 1-year anniversary of the date that a disparaging misquote in *The New York Times* was posted, January 10 of 2019, this being January 10 of 2020.

I am hopeful that this new year we have, 2020, will bring about some clarity of vision on the part of my colleagues, the American people, and I don't know that I have as much hope for the press. But this day, a year ago today, I was misquoted by *The New York Times*. The *Times* alleged that I had used three terms and asked, why does that language become offensive?

Well, the truth is that it was a 56-minute telephone interview, a call on my cell phone. I didn't have a way to tape it. But I have a practice over the years, I have done interviews with any kind of media I can think of, and if I don't have a means to tape what I say to them, I make it a point not to repeat anything, say anything that I haven't already said to the press. That way, there is nothing new out there for them to take and manipulate it in the article.

□ 1300

When that phone rang that morning on the 5th of January, 2019, if that is a